

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Addie for the courteous interview accorded applicant's attorney.

During the interview the merits of the presently claimed invention were discussed in connection with the prior art.

The examiner indicated that he was interpreting the claimed "salient point" as being met by the entire projection 20 of Cobb et al., including the right-angle sides thereof which project from the apex. Each of claims 28 and 37 now recites that the salient points are defined at the ends of respective radii of the roller, each such radius constituting a maximum radius which is larger than the maximum radius of the compacting faces disposed between the salient points. Therefore, it is submitted that only the apex of each V-shaped projection 20 of Cobb et al. would correspond to a claimed salient point.

As the roller of Cobb et al. rolls over a surface, it is periodically supported on such an apex, and then rolls off the apex. Assuming that the sections of the drum 10 situated between successive projections eventually make contact with the ground, there would still not occur compaction between the apex and the drum section, due to the fact that the apex is spaced from the drum by the sides of the projection.

Rather, the roller will ride up on the apex, storing potential energy, and then fall downwardly, whereupon the stored potential energy is delivered to the soil as an impact blow by the drum surface. That is how the impressions 43 are formed in the soil to facilitate the correct placement of seeds during planting.

Attorney's Docket No. 025455-093
Application No. 09/830,403
Page 6

That impacting action is the very phenomenon that the present invention seeks to avoid as discussed in the last paragraph of page 5 and the first paragraph of page 6 of the present specification. In that regard, each of claims 28 and 37 recites that each compacting face extends "from one salient point to an adjacent salient point" whereby the roller applies a continuous kneading action to the soil "at all angular positions thereof."

In Cobb et al., the drum surface does not extend to each salient point (i.e., apex of the projection 20). Rather, the drum surface extends to a radially inner edge of one side of a respective projection 20. That side is not generally convex; it is flat. Consequently, no continuous kneading action is applied to the soil; rather, periodic impacts are delivered as described above.

Other prior art of record has similar differences from the presently claimed invention. For example, in Roberts U.S. Patent 5,860,764, a drum also has projections 62 similar to the projections 20 of Cobb et al. The salient points are defined by the apexes of the projections 62. The cylindrical sections of the drum 60 do not extends from one salient point to the next, as presently claimed, but rather extend to the radially inner edges of the sides of the projections. Moreover, those sides are flat as can be seen in Fig. 6. The projections are intended to form rumble strips in asphalt, not to perform a continuous kneading of soil as presently claimed.

Attorney's Docket No. 025455-093
Application No. 09/830,403
Page 7

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 28 and 137 distinguish over the applied prior art, and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 
Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25,813

Date: June 1, 2004

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620